

AN OPEN LETTER,

—TO THE—

HONORABLE EDWARD BLAKE, Q.C., EX-M.P.

SIR,— Since the ratification by Parliament of the report which you persuaded the Committee of the House of Commons to adopt, I have refrained from replying to the numerous abusive articles, which from day to day have appeared in the Grit press, being content to wait until Parliament met, when no doubt an opportunity would have been afforded me to expose your duplicity and cunning in connection with the transactions and proceedings of the Committee. But Parliament having been dissolved, and having determined that I would not again offer myself for re-election, it may not be out of place to address you a few observations in connection with the part you played in Parliament, and upon that Committee, when the question of the Cypress Hills Timber Limit was under discussion. I also propose to direct your attention especially to a few pages in your political history which I think will convince even yourself that you are one of the most contemptible politicians who ever aspired to a seat in either of the Houses of Parliament. You certainly will have no reason to complain of me resurrecting your transactions of a few years ago, when you did not think it beneath your dignity to discuss in Parliament the contents of letters, written eight years ago by two gentlemen to each other, of a purely private and confidential character, and which you knew had either been stolen from my office or extracted from briefs in your office in contravention of an express agreement with your brother. I fully recognize your very great ability and legal cunning, as illustrated by the manner in which you hoodwinked the Minister of Justice, who, after a patient and thorough examination of the evidence, reported to the

Committee that I had done nothing corrupt, and that I had done nothing calling for the censure of Parliament. Your success in converting him to your way of thinking, and inducing him to go back upon himself will remain as a monument of your partisan skill.

In regard to that report let me say, that if you were honest and conscientious when you made your speech in Parliament on the motion made by that political trickster and humbug, Sir Richard Cartwright, you would have condemned the course pursued by the Committee in investigating matters which you yourself admitted were beyond the authority of Parliament. In the speech made by you on that motion you said : "The question is whether there is fit matter to be referred to a committee, and whether that matter arises by virtue of alleged breach of a statute, or by virtue of an alleged violation of those obligations or that unwritten law which guards the honor of Parliament; the same principle applies to all. *But I say there is here no charge that the Independence of Parliament Act has been broken. Again, there is no case here made of a breach of any laws regulating the disposition of Timber Limits.* Again, and this is not an unimportant point in regard to some of the observations made by the hon. member for Lincoln, there is no case made here, and no charge of any fraud having been committed upon Mr. Sands, the purchaser of these limits, and, therefore, that is not a matter suggested as enquirable here. He may have been defrauded and he may not; he may have been defrauded by the hon. member for Lincoln, or by Mr. Adams, or by neither of them. *It is a matter with which we have nothing to do in the issues before us. And, lastly, there is no case whatever made of wrong of any kind, save whatever wrong is alleged to be apparent in the hon. member's own letters printed in the votes, and in his own statements made in this House.*"

In the Report presented by you to the Committee, you say : "We find that in fact no corrupt advances were made by Mr. Rykert to any Minister, either directly or through any relatives or otherwise; and that *his letters are, in this particular, untrue, and we find that the relations of Ministers mentioned were not offered, did not ask for, and did not receive, any money in respect of this matter.*"

Let me here say that you knew you were misleading the Committee, and placed on record a deliberate falsehood, when you said that my letters stated I had made corrupt advances to members. I defy you to point to one single syllable in any letter making any such statement. If it be true that the Independence of Parliament Act was not broken by me, and that there was no breach by me of any laws regulating the disposition of timber limits, why all this fuss in the papers that I had robbed the country of such an enormous sum, more especially when you report that I had done no wrong in obtaining the limit for Mr. Adams? The fact of the matter is, Mr. Blake, you were playing the part of a hypocrite when you made your speech, leading the House to believe that you would under no circumstances unjustly condemn me, and yet at the same time you hoped to elicit something before the Committee which would convict your old time opponent. Your conduct before the Committee satisfied every

person who watched your course that you were straining every nerve to show something dishonorable in the means employed in getting the limit.

If that finding were correct, then the charges of corruption made against me fell to the ground, and you, as an honest man, should have so reported. But you had your vindictive spite and malice to gratify, and in so doing you stultified your principles as enunciated in your speech, and reported adversely against me upon a matter which, even if true, Parliament, according to your own opinion, had no right to interfere with. If, as you allege, Parliament could not take cognizance of any robbery of Sands, either by Adams or myself, what on earth had it to do with the alleged bribery by me of an agent of the C. P. R. to betray his employers?

You knew when you penned that part of the Report that you had failed in sustaining any charge against me, and hoped to blindfold Parliament and the people by charging me with an offence less serious than that of robbing Mr. Sands, which you admitted you could not take any cognizance of, and you knew also that there was not one particle of evidence to justify you in reporting that I had been guilty of a corrupt act in bribing Mr. Muckle, but on the other hand, you knew the evidence was directly contrary to the Report. Your own organ in May, 1890, a few days before the Election, gave us the proof of the falsity of your Report, by the publication of a letter from the same man Muckle, who stated "*that your Report was an infamous lie, and a disgrace to the Parliament of Canada.*" Notwithstanding your organ produced this evidence of my innocence of the corrupt charge, you had not the manly candor and honesty to come forward and admit your error. Magnanimity is not one of the characteristics of your life.

Mr. Muckle uses very strong language in his letter, and perhaps stronger than an old Parliamentarian, would be justified in using, but I must admit I do not dissent therefrom, and I think I would be quite justified in using still stronger if the English language would enable me to do so. You also ignored the sworn testimony of Mr. Lindsay Russell, the former deputy minister, Mr. Burgess our present deputy, a Reformer appointed by your Government to office, and Mr. Ryley, gentlemen whose reputations stand high, and assumed that I had actually induced those gentlemen to commit a gross fraud upon Mr. McCarthy, who had applied for a portion of this same limit for Mr. Laidlaw. You knew well that you were reporting adverse to the evidence, and upon a matter which had never been referred to the Committee, and which you should have refused to investigate, but you thought you could throw a little dirt at me to gratify your malicious spite against me. In order to make good your report you very ingeniously tried to prove that Mr. Lindsay Russell was not at the time (a year before he resigned) in a fit state of mind to act, and you were base enough to insinuate that Mr. Burgess and Mr. Ryley two as honorable men as there are in the employ of the government, and who corroborated Mr. Russell's report, were guilty of perjury. There can be no other interpretation placed upon your report. These gentlemen, as you are aware, distinctly swore that the allotment of the limits to Adams and Laidlaw was made with the consent and concurrence of Mr.

McCarthy, and I am personally aware that they told the truth. Your mean and cowardly act in invoking the rules of Parliament to prevent me explaining my reasons for resigning my seat in Parliament will forever stamp you as a coward. You knew I could expose a little game practised before the committee, therefor you prevented me referring to the same on the ground that nothing transpiring in the committee could be spoken of in the House until the report was made. You knew well that the proceedings of the committee were irregular and that nearly all its deliberations were carried on without even a quorum.

I would gladly meet you upon any platform in this Province and discuss the evidence upon which you framed what Mr. Muckle called an infamous and lying report, but I know from your past history that you are too much of a coward to meet any opponent. In 1882 I challenged you to meet me, and you then accepted the challenge, but, true to your instincts, you positively refused to let me reply to you when you came into my constituency to oppose my election.

You always have been, and you always will be, a coward, a reputation which you enjoyed when we were school-fellows together. You proved yourself as such at the general election in 1878, when you deserted your party in its hour of trouble and left the country. And you have again beaten your own record at one of the most important periods in this country's history, by sneaking away from the threatening cloud, and under cover of a letter, which you had not the honesty to publish, you quietly desert the party which had so fondly worshipped you and which you so delighted to lead when you thought victory was within your grasp. Why did you not, as an honest man who placed his country before his party, publicly declare that you could not support the policy of the ragged crew which looked to Washington for its inspiration? Why did you permit an unscrupulous gang, with whom you could no longer act, to throw an annexation firebrand into the Dominion without warning the country and its people who had so long recognized your very great ability? Why did you quietly sit still and permit that Christian politician, Oliver Mowat, to telegraph a deliberate falsehood to that incomparable humbug, Davies, of Prince Edward Island if it were not to save him from defeat? You were content to let the party, if possible gain a temporary advantage and reach power under false pretences, although you admit in that famous state document promulgated after the election, that the Grit policy means annexation and severance of the tie which binds us to the mother country. Blake, you know it was your moral cowardice which prevented you acting honestly and in good faith towards your native country. For the third time in your political history the *Globe* denounces you and thinks your defection of little consequence.

You have paraded your honesty and integrity so much before the people, that I now take the liberty of reminding you of some of your public acts, which you cannot but admit must stamp you as one of the most vacillating and dishonest politicians now before the people of Canada. I know it will be gall and wormwood to you to have the public gaze into the panorama of your political career, but as I have lost the opportunity which

I have long looked for, in Parliament, I want the people of Canada to see what a record one of *my Judges* has, and how competent he was to pronounce upon the honesty of one of his fellow men. It will be impossible for me to do more than summarize the several points to which I desire to direct your attention in this letter, but I will yet have an opportunity to go more into detail, particularly if I can draw you out before the public. It is a wonder your hand did not become paralyzed when you penned the Report alleging that I had been guilty of bribing a man to betray his employers, for it must have called to your mind the several periods in your political history when you, for your own personal advantage, induced, if you did not bribe, certain public men to betray their colleagues and political friend Alexander McKenzie. You surely have not forgotten that eventful period in your history when you induced the Hon. E. B. Wood to betray his colleagues, and placed on record that famous letter which for brevity and fullness of meaning is without a parallel. I refer to the "Speak now" letter. Of course you have tried to convince the public that you did not hold out the promise to this same E. B. Wood, but your denial has not met with any favor. It is a singular circumstance, however, that your Government shortly afterwards rewarded this same man with a Chief-Justiceship. You cannot have forgotten the bargain and sale made between you and R. W. Scott when you induced him to leave the Speaker's chair and desert his leaders, and then rewarded him with "The Crown Lands or nothing." This public act of yours forever stamped you as a man who for greed and gain would forsake his principles and betray his party. You well know that you had howled yourself hoarse in denouncing "Coalitions," as debasing and dishonorable, and yet, as I say, for the sake of your personal aggrandizement, you did not hesitate in the case of a party emergency, to bolt your principles of a lifetime, and induce a man to act a treacherous part towards his colleagues.

But there is a matter in connection with this same R. W. Scott and yourself which went a great length to satisfy the public that you made a corrupt bargain with that gentleman.

On Nov. 22, 1871, this same R. W. Scott on behalf of, and as one of, the shareholders of the defunct Canada Central Railway, petitioned the Ontario Government for aid from the Railway Fund for that portion of the road between Sand Point and Pembroke, stating in the petition that: "The Company was unfortunately unable to avail itself of the subsidy of 12,000 acres per mile before the expiration of the charter under which it was conferred." A few days after the presentation of this petition Sanfield McDonald was defeated, and this same R. W. Scott was taken into your Government. In February 1872, your Blake-Scott-McKenzie Government was graciously pleased to comply with the petition of R. W. Scott, and granted \$119,250 to the Canada Central Railway, although you knew, as well as I did, that this same R. W. Scott had never complied with the terms of the original charter, and had not built the road along the Ottawa River, as therein provided. You knew it was only a makeshift to build the road twenty-eight miles to Carleton Place and then call

it the Canada Central; but, Blake, you knew he had you by the throat and you had to reward his treachery. You know better than anybody else whether that transaction was the result of your purchase of R. W. Scott. At any rate the country was robbed of that amount of money to gratify the insatiable appetite of R. W. Scott, your then colleague, and you were a party to it. But, Mr. Blake, that is not the only drain the public exchequer had to stand through your kindly offices towards this same R. W. Scott. You are fully aware that Mr. Scott and the shareholders of the Canada Central Railway petitioned Parliament to recognize their claim to 342,000 acres of land as a subsidy, and that the claim was rejected by Sanfield McDonald, although he did offer to leave the whole question to the Court, which offer R. W. Scott declined. Mr. Scott, after extracting the modest sum of \$119,250 from Blake, Scott & Co., made up his mind to renew his claim for the land subsidy, which had been so often rejected by previous Governments. He induced your Government to pass an Act called: "An Act to provide for the institution of suits against the Crown by Petition of Right," and then filed a Petition of Right on May 25, 1872, on behalf of the Canada Central Railway Company against the Blake, Scott & Co. Government, claiming these 342,000 acres of land for twenty-eight and a half miles of railway. This petition, you, Mr. Blake, duly recognized, and filed an answer to the same through your Attorney General, denying the right of the Company to the lands. The case was tried Sept. 20, 1872; three witnesses were called on behalf of the Company, but Blake, Scott & Co. for the defence did not feel it necessary to call any, although they knew that it could be proved that the Company had failed in the conditions of its Charter, and had forfeited all right to the land. Judgment was given against the Province on this *one-sided* statement of facts for 342,000 acres of land. You will recollect I brought the matter before Parliament and asked for a new trial, but instead of asking for this, Mr. Mowat only sought a re-hearing of the case on the same evidence, which you well knew was a mere farce. But, Mr. Blake, the gravamen of my charge against you now comes to the front. On the argument of the appeal, you had the audacity to appear as Counsel for the Railway Company, (see the *Globe* report of that date) although you and your Government had put in the defence for the Province. Just fancy counsel and representative of the plaintiffs appearing for and on behalf of the defence. You, as the leader of the Ontario bar, knew that any fourth-rate lawyer would have been stripped of his gown if the attention of the Law Society had been drawn to the transaction. But, you, as the leader of the bar, seem privileged to take both sides of the case if it suits your purposes to do so.

But, Mr. Blake, that is not all. The direct result of your deal with R. W. Scott cost the country over \$1,900,000. You knew that the counties of Lanark and Renfrew, Elizabethtown and Brockville, were indebted to the M. L. Fund in that amount, and these municipalities had loaned this money to the Brockville and Ottawa Railway and took a mortgage upon the road. Although this mortgage was perfectly good and valid, the Government reduced the debt to \$500,000 and then, on March

28, 1873, offset this mortgage against the judgment of Scott & Co. procured against the Province for 342,000 acres of land. You knew that there was no just reason why this bona fide claim held by the Province, and which was duly secured to them by the Railway Company, should have been reduced by over one million and a quarter dollars. But it was done, and the sequel shows that R. W. Scott & Co. and the Canada Central Railway Co. pirates got the whole benefit of it.

You know that this same R. W. Scott, after filing his petition and immediately after he joined your Government, made a show of transferring his stock in the Railway Company in order that the Blake, Scott & Co. Government might be pleased to grant R. W. Scott & Co. the prayer of the said petition.

I am afraid, however, Mr. Blake, if my information is correct, that this is not the only occasion when you have advised upon both sides of a case, a privilege which you seem specially to enjoy. Upon this point I shall in a future letter have something more to say, and will endeavor to give you several reminders.

But, Mr. Blake, there is another matter which has long since remained unexplained, although I have publicly on several occasions drawn your attention to the same. If the statement made by Hon. Mr. McDougall at Millbrook in 1877 be true, (and your reticence would rather justify anyone in taking it for granted) the public cannot but conclude that you are totally unworthy to occupy the high and distinguished position of leader of the Ontario bar. Mr. McDougall, in speaking of the timber limit transaction of Mr. Scott of Peterboro, said:

"Mr. Blake undertook to present the case before the Commissioner of Crown Lands in the interests of his client. The client was a Mr. Benedict, a wealthy American gentleman, and he (Benedict) told him (McDougall) that on one occasion he considered influence was necessary (as 'was the case in his own country) in order to get a favorable decision, 'and he was ready to pay for it. As Mr. Blake had made the Government, he secured his services and his influence. He (McDougall) asked 'him what he paid Mr. Blake. He said: 'I paid him \$1,000 in gold. 'There was another lawyer in the case, and when he found that Mr. Blake got so much, he wanted more. The result was that Mr. Blake 'got afraid that there would be an exposure, and he sent back the money to 'me, very much to my regret, because I believed if he had kept it I would 'have won my case.' Mr. Blake accepted from this gentleman \$1,000, 'not for exercising his professional knowledge or abilities in the Courts, not 'for professional services, but for the exercise of his influence as a politician over gentlemen who were under his influence. He (McDougall) did 'not know that the history of this country presented an example like this, 'and he was amazed when he heard that Mr. Blake had made that charge 'for the exercise of his friendly interference in a case of that kind."

I may say that I have the testimony of several gentlemen who corroborate all Mr. McDougall has said of you. Is it not a wonder that you would dare speak of my letters boasting I had exercised an influence, when

you yourself were actually paid \$1,000 in order to induce you to exercise your influence over the Crown Lands Commissioner, whom you had created, and which sum you so greedily accepted? Why did you return the money if the transaction were straightforward? You knew that you were caught red-handed and quietly sneaked out of the affair.

Let me draw your attention to another matter which requires a very full explanation, and that is the transaction between you and Mr. J. L. McDougall, the present Auditor General. You knew that there was law, called the Insolvency Law, which rendered an insolvent liable to punishment for preferring one creditor over another, and providing that any creditor who accepted a preference from his debtor, knowing him to be insolvent, was liable to disgorge. You will recollect that this same McDougall to your knowledge became insolvent, and at that time owed you a large amount of money, and *that you compelled him to secure you in full to the prejudice of other creditors.* You surely will not deny that. If you do, I can accommodate you with the sworn testimony of Mr. McDougall, where *he swears distinctly that he was obliged to secure you in full after he became insolvent, of which fact you were well aware.* But that is not all, Mr. Blake. At the very time he secured you, he was promised the office of Auditor General (as he swears) and that your Government afterwards appointed him to that office. Why was this done, if not to enable him to pay off the security he gave you? It looks marvellously suspicious, Mr. Blake. Will you kindly inform the public if you are the Minister who promised him the office? Will you also inform the public when the same Mr. McDougall paid you the amount he says he was compelled to secure, and whether or not he paid you by instalments out of his salary which your Government so thoughtfully placed at his disposal? This is a matter of far greater interest to the public than my private letters which were made public through a theft or treachery. You however know that if any other lawyer had done as you did, the Law Society would at your instigation, have stripped him of his gown. It was your greed for gain that induced you to take this course, and thus render your old college friend, McDougall, liable to the penalties and punishments imposed by the act; but this characteristic stands out prominently through your whole life.

You recollect how eloquently you denounced what was termed the Section "B" Scandal, and proclaimed to the world that it would be a gross outrage upon the people of Canada if McDonald & Manning were paid their enormous claim of nearly \$400,000. But, Mr. Blake you nobly assisted this same firm in obtaining their whole claim *by means of your partner*, who received a retainer of \$500 and a daily refresher for attending the arbitration. This had the effect of shutting your mouth, for afterwards, when the amount of the award was voted upon in Parliament, your eloquence ceased, and no more denunciation of the Section "B" Scandal was heard from your mouth. And now I will let you into the secret: You are one of the Members to whom I referred in my address of 1890 when I stated that there were M. Ps. who sat in Parliament voting money

into their own pocket. I can give you the names of others, if you particularly want them.

We have another evidence of your greed for gain in the attitude lately assumed by you in respect of the C. P. R. Who would have ever dreamed that the Edward Blake of 1882-3-4, who so eloquently denounced the C. P. R. magnates as a set of cormorants and swindlers, would have accepted a small *doceur* of say \$25,000 or thereabouts, and a daily refresher way up in the hundreds for the purpose of assisting that Company in extracting from the pockets of the hard-fisted sons of Canada an enormous sum in connection with the Onderdonk Contract, which you more than once publicly stated was too good a bargain for the C. P. R. It is no wonder, Mr. Blake, that you tried to gain so much notoriety by donating \$20,000 to the University of which you are so distinguished a member. The amount was a mere bagatelle compared to the fees which you have received, and will receive from the C. P. R. but do you think you are playing the part of a patriotic citizen by aiding and abetting the C. P. R. in drawing from the public treasury money to which you some time ago said they were not entitled? I noticed that in the correspondence between you and Mr. Kirkpatrick published in the *Empire* of Saturday last you very ingeniously referred to the case of the Manitoba crossing and admit you were paid the modest sum of \$500. But that is not the charge. The question was what did you receive for the Onderdonk Arbitration, and what are you to receive? That is what Mr. Cartwright referred to when he wanted to give his testimony, as I understand the matter. Let us have all the facts, Mr. Blake, now that the question of your fees has become public property and it is well known that you were seen by the C. P. R. You cannot object upon the ground of privacy after aiding and abetting the great "Mixer and Muddler" Cartwright in dragging my private affairs before Parliament. Do you for one moment imagine that anyone believes that you accepted a fee of \$500 to compel the Government to satisfy the C. P. R., when their claim was up in the millions, and that you did not demand and were not paid a daily refresher of at least \$150, for attending the arbitration. Blake, you know you are practicing your old game of deceit in trying to hoodwink the people on the question of fees. For once in your lifetime stop splitting hairs, as the *Hamilton Times* terms it.

I would like to ask you if it was a decent thing for you to permit your partner to accept fees from bankers to oppose or watch the Act relating to bills of Exchange, while it was before the House of Commons? Was it within the bounds of Parliamentary rules for you to participate as a partner in fees paid for legislation? Was it within your duty as a member of the Commons to stand up and argue in favor of suggestions made by your partner when he was paid for the work? And was it within the bounds of decency for this ~~same~~ partner to actually sit on the floor of the House while the Bill was before it, and listen to and act upon your valuable suggestions? But, Mr. Blake, you have always been, and will remain a mystery. You were repeatedly pronounced a disturber by the great *Globe*, and you yourself told the Parliament of Canada that you were "restive." There

was, however, no necessity for that, as it was quite self-evident. From the time you delivered your Aurora speech, full of impracticabilities and theories of a nondescript character, down to the time you quietly sat still and saw your fellow members betray and supplant your leader, Alexander McKenzie, knowing that you were to be his successor, you have proved yourself restive and impracticable. You have been repeatedly snubbed by the organ of your party for your vacillating course in Parliament, particularly on the occasion when you did your utmost to undermine and injure Mr. McKenzie in connection with the Nanaima & Esquimaux Railway. You were then shown up in your true colors, and the public given to understand that your inordinate vanity must receive a check.

After your display of treachery to Mr. McKenzie, the *Globe* on March 31, 1875, referred to you in the following flattering language:

"These divisions only proved the hold the Administration had upon the confidence of the country: not because the followers were asked to make any sacrifice in order to support them, *but because the temporary defection of certain members, (Hon. Edward Blake, etc.) met with so small a response from the party generally.* There always will be politicians as there always have been (How correctly he gauged you, did he not?) anxious above all things to keep down national expenditure, and to get credit by way of eminence for being very careful of public funds. The attempt to catch a majority against the Government was equally unworthy and transparently factious."

There is one thing I always admired in George Brown, and that was his hatred of a man who proved treacherous to his own friends.

Your dissolving views upon almost all public questions are matters of history. No man supported with more energy and vigor the question of Prohibition, as your speeches bear testimony, yet on the eve of an election, when you thought you would gain more support by coquetting with the License holders, you suddenly faced about in a speech delivered at Aylmer, and pronounced Prohibition as impracticable, and yet you were continually bidding for the temperance vote.

Your outrageous appeal to the passions and prejudices of the people and electors of Ontario in order to defeat the late Sanfield McDonald on the question of the murder of Thomas Scott, will ever stamp you as a political trickster. Your hypocritical cry of that period was soon forgotten when your Government was asked to offer a reward for the murderer of Scott. Again you played the part of a hypocrite when you pledged your word that no party would be built up on the Regina scaffold, and then when office was within reach as you thought, you joined hands with the men who were willing to appeal to the worst passion and prejudice of the people, with a view to the destruction of the Government.

You for years loudly appealed to the people with your free trade nostrums and ideas, and after vainly endeavoring to educate them to your views, you suddenly changed front on the heights of Malvern and then threw yourself into the arms of those whom you had previously denounced as bloated monopolists?

In your peregrinations through the Maritime Provinces, you loudly advocated the removal of the duty on flour, yet when the member for Northumberland put you to the test in Parliament, by moving for the abolition of that duty, you quietly stepped out of the House and shirked the vote. This, however, is an old trick of yours. The records of Parliament show that upon several occasions when brought face to face with the principles you had advocated when in opposition, notably that of submitting all contracts to Parliament for its approval, you rushed from the House when the votes were being taken in order to avoid the recording of your vote.

There are so many other questions of a public nature, with which your name has been associated in anything but a flattering manner, that I feel it would be wise for me to postpone the discussion to a later date. In the meantime, if it would be any satisfaction to you, I would let you peruse the volume of my scrap books which I have especially devoted to you, and from which I prepared the brief which I intended to use when you accepted my challenge, but which I was deprived of the pleasure of using by your cowardly refusal to hear me.

The record which you have made for yourself is one of which you certainly must feel proud. The public may think I am somewhat prejudiced in my summary of your public acts, and therefore I will call to the front a witness, whose judgment and opinion of you will be properly appreciated. The Hon. Wm. McDougall, than whom there is no better judge of the characters of our public men, spoke of you at Millbrook, as follows:

"If ever there was any one man at the bar, who had shown in his 'career a desire to avail himself of his position in order to forward and 'advance his own interests, that man was Edward Blake. If ever there 'was a man who had shewn as a member of the Government and as a 'lawyer, disregard to the proprieties and duties of his position, that man 'was Edward Blake. He (McDougall) saw him carrying his bag day after 'day to the Courts in Toronto, when he was drawing his salary 'as Minister of Justice, and appearing in private causes before 'the Judges he had made and whom he could by a reconstruction of the 'Courts, removed to an inferior position. Was not that an indelicate thing? 'The matter was noticed in the papers, and he immediately bundled up 'his bags and papers and posted himself off. He was a member of the 'Local Government for a time. He was chief of the Government and he 'exercised his influence in advancing the interests of his own Chancery 'clique in Toronto. Mr. Edward Blake, after he was at the head of the 'Government, was found practicing in the Crown Land Department, receiving large fees to promote causes in that office."

Do you want anything stronger than this? If you do I will let you have it in a future letter. You may rest assured that I shall never quietly submit to be humiliated by you and others without letting the people have the whole facts in connection with this timber limit transaction. I care not who may be the sufferer. You have done your very best to disgrace me and my family in the estimation of the public and you need not feel annoyed or surprised if I give you a 'Roland for an

Oliver,' I know that I can satisfy the Parliament of Canada that it has unwittingly done me an act of injustice, and I certainly would have done so before resigning my seat, had I not been given to understand that the report would not be adopted if I resigned and tested the opinion and judgment of my constituents. Before parting this time I would like to ask you if you can name ten members in the whole House of Commons who read all the evidence produced before the Committee. You know you cannot do so. When the report was passed by the House of Commons not one half of the members were in their seats, and I unhesitatingly assert that not ten of that number had ever read the whole of the evidence. Later on I shall deal further with this branch of the case and let the public know the reasons for the capitulation of the Minister of Justice and the length of time it took you to convince the sub-committee that it was better to adopt the report which Mr. Muckle in the *Globe* of May last characterized as *an infamous lie and a disgrace to the Parliament of Canada*.

Yours truly,

J. C. RYKERT.

St. Catharines, March 9th, 1891.